

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and reexamination of the subject Application are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 13, 22, and 26 are amended, claim 23 has been cancelled, and claims 33-42 are added. Claims 1-22, and 24-42 are thus all the claims pending in the Application.

The Amendment filed on April 28, 2010 amended the claims to address the claim objections from the Final Office Action. The Examiner indicated in the May 10, 2010 Advisory Action that the Amendment would be entered. Accordingly, Applicant requests entry of the Amendment filed April 28, 2010. The above amendment assumes such entry.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

**Claims 1 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754).** Claim 22 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 23. Accordingly, this rejection of claim 22 is now moot.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of retrieving, from said centralized source, a language choice of a person according to the respective electronically identifiable physical location of the person; and providing using an application an output to the person in the retrieved language choice at said respective electronically identifiable physical location in said venue on the basis of a real time translation into the retrieved language choice.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited art of record teach or suggest these features of amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

**Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 11-15, 17-21, 23-26, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754).**

Claim 2

With respect to claim 2, the Examiner admits that Rankin, McCarten, and Kumano do not teach a principal language. The Examiner looks to Poch for a disclosure of the principal language. Poch is cited solely for the foregoing limited purpose and does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin alone or in combination with McCarten and Kumano. Thus, the claim 2 would be patentable based on its dependency from claim 1.

Moreover, claim 2 has been amended to recite that those of said persons who do not choose a language are assigned a same language choice, the same language choice being a principal language.

The Examiner acknowledges that the combination of Rankin, McCarten, and Kumano do not teach this feature but cites Poch as allegedly curing the deficiency.

**Poch**

In the Advisory Action dated May 10, 2010, the Examiner indicates that Poch teaches that if a user does not reprogram a receiver, the user will receive messages in the “one language” which the receiver is already programmed to receive and which may be any one of many different languages. Thus, Poch does not teach the feature that persons who do not choose a language are assigned a same language choice, as recited by amended claim 2. Amended claim 2 is therefore patentable over the art of record for this additional reason.

Claim 22

Claim 22 has been amended to recite the feature of assigning to each of said passengers who has not chosen a language a same language choice being a principle language. The Examiner acknowledges that the combination of Rankin, McCarten, and Kumano do not teach this feature but cites Poch as allegedly curing the deficiency.

**Poch**

In the Advisory Action dated May 10, 2010, the Examiner indicates that Poch teaches that if a user does not reprogram a receiver, the user will receive messages in the “one language” which the receiver is already programmed to receive and which may be any one of many different languages. Thus, Poch does not teach the feature that persons who do not choose a

language are assigned a same language choice, as recited by amended claim 22. Amended claim 22 is therefore patentable over the art of record for this reason.

*Claims 5, 13, and 26*

Claims 5, 13, and 26 have each been amended in a similar manner to claim 22. Accordingly, claims 5, 13, and 26 are patentable for similar reasons as claim 22.

*Dependent Claims*

The remaining claims are patentable over the art of record based on their respective dependencies.

**Claims 6, 16, 27, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754), in further view of Li et al. (6,205,418).**

This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claims 6, 16, and 27, the Examiner admits that Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention making said respective language choices accessible by an attendant so that said attendant can anticipate the language needs of a respective person. The Examiner looks to Li for a disclosure of “making said respective language choices accessible by an attendant so that said attendant can anticipate the language needs of a respective person.

Li is cited solely for the foregoing limited purpose and does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin alone or in combination with McCarten and Poch. Thus, the claims would be patentable.

With respect to claim 32, the Examiner admits that Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention the system is operable to receive said language choices from an operator who has received the respective language choices from one or more of the passengers. The Examiner looks to Li for a disclosure of a system that “is operable to receive said language choices from an operator who has received the respective language choices **(Abstract).**”

Li is cited solely for the foregoing limited purpose and does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin alone or in combination with McCarten and Poch. Thus, the claims would be patentable.

**Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin, McCarten, Poch, Kumano, and in further view of Glenn.** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claims 8 and 10, the Examiner admits that Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a prerecorded audio translation in the language choice of a respective person, and look to Poch for a prerecorded audio translation in the language choice of a respective person (**Col 3 lines 65-66, Col 4 lines 31-37**),” and to Glenn for “a message [that] is accessible by means of a headphone or ear-piece output allocated to a respective person, whereby a respective person can access said personal announcement by means of a headset connected to said output (**Col 3 lines 40-42**),” and a “message [that] comprises a prerecorded text translation of the message in the language choice of a respective person, accessible by means of a display allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can read said message on said display (**Fig. 2**).”

Glenn is cited solely for the foregoing limited purpose and does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin alone or in combination with McCarten and Poch. Thus, the claims would be patentable.

#### **New Claims**

Claims 33-42 have been added, and find support at paragraphs 0013, paragraph 0027, and paragraphs 0099-0100 of Applicant’s original disclosure as reflected in the published application. Claims 33-42 are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Kevin C. Kunzendorf /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Kevin C. Kunzendorf  
Registration No. 58,308

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 28, 2010